

intendants of the widespread distress which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes."

When the collision between economic interests and the policy of compulsory conformity was so flagrant, it is not surprising that the economists of the age should have enunciated the healing principle, that persecution was -incompatible with prosperity, since it was on the, pioneers of economic progress that persecution principally fell. " Every law of this nature/¹ wrote the author of a pamphlet on the subject, is not only ^{CE} expressly against the very principles and rules of the Gospel of Christ/' but is also " destructive to the trade and well-being of our nation by oppressing and driving away the most industrious working hands, and depopulating, and thereby impoverishes our country, which is capable of employing ten times the number of people we now have." ^{1§}

Temple, in his calm and lucid study of the United Netherlands, found one reason of their success in the fact that, Roman Catholicism excepted, every man might practise what religion he pleased.^{2*} De la Court, whose striking "IT" passed under the name of John de Witt, said the same.⁸¹ Petty, after pointing out that in England the most thriving towns were those where there was most nonconformity, cited the evidence, not only of Europe, but of India and the Otto-

man Empire, to prove that, while economic progress is compatible with any religion, the class which is its vehicle will always consist of the heterodox minority, who " profess opinions different from what are publicly established." M " There is a kind of natural unaptness/" wrote a pamphleteer in 1671, "in the Popish religion to business, whereas on the contrary among the Reformed, the greater their zeal, the greater their inclination to trade and industry, as holding idleness unlawful. The domestic interest of England lieth in the advance-ment of trade by removing all obstructions both in city and country, and providing such laws as may